

REMARKS

On October 21, 2004, Applicants filed a Response to a rejection of claims 1-23, along with a Request for Continued Examination. In the Response, Applicants also added claims 24-58. In an Official Action dated January 6, 2005, the Examiner imposed a three-way restriction requirement on the previously examined claims, as well as the newly presented claims.

Since Applicants' undersigned attorney was unable to determine why the Examiner had imposed the restriction requirement after the claims had been examined, and since Applicant's undersigned attorney was unable to determine why the Examiner had broken the claims up in the manner that he did, Applicants' undersigned attorney attempted to reconcile these issues in a teleconference with the Examiner.

Applicants' undersigned attorney re-iterates the traversal of the restriction requirement, especially at this late of a date. The claims have already been examined, and now the Examiner wishes to impose a restriction requirement after an RCE has been filed. There is no justification for the restriction requirement, other than to say that the Examiner has decided now that the claims have been classified into three different classifications. However, there is no explanation as to why the different groups of claims should be classified separately. Accordingly, Applicants traverse the restriction requirement.

Furthermore, if the Examiner maintains the restriction requirement, Applicants request that the Examiner explain the features in the different claims that are the basis for the Examiner's classification of the various claims.

Although Applicant do not believe that restriction is proper, in order to make this Response complete, Applicants elect Invention II identified in the Official Action. In addition, as best as Applicants' undersigned attorney could understand the basis for the

Examiner's classification of the different claims, Applicant has amended the claims so that pending claims 1-58 read on invention II.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if the Examiner believes that issues remain regarding the allowability of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN
A Professional Corporation
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By _____


Stephen H. Eland
PTO Registration No. 41,010

Telephone: (215) 563-4100
Facsimile: (215) 563-4044

Petition for Extension Under 37 CFR §1.136(a)

Applicant's undersigned Attorney hereby petitions for an extension of time of One month beyond the time period set in the last office communication. The proper fee is enclosed as identified in the enclosed Fee Transmittal form.

March 7, 2005
Date of Certificate


Stephen H. Eland
PTO Registration No. 41,010